DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 392 CE 035 258

TITLE	The Work-Education Consortium Project: A Report on the First Two Years.
INSTITUTION	National Inst. for Work and Learning, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
CONTRACT	DOL-99-6-653-42-8
NOTE	80p.; For related documents, see ED 117 347, ED 142 726, ED 172 030-031, and ED 200 708.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Coordination; *Educational Cooperation; *Education Work Relationship; Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; Linking Agents; National Programs; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *School Districts; Secondary Education; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	Educational Brokerage; *Work Education Consortium Project; *Work Education Councils

ABSTRACT

The Work-Education Consortium Project was undertaken to increase from school to work. During the first 2 years of the project, 21 community employment institutions, and the public to facilitate a smoother transition from school to work. During the first two years of the project, 21 community work education councils were formed. Programmatically, the councils moved into a number of program areas, employing varied strategies and techniques. Among the program areas addressed by the individual councils were the following: development of community volunteer networks; implementation of employability, vocational exploration, and job exposure programs; design and implementation of occupational awareness courses for teachers; development of a labor-management curriculum; and organization of state and regional conferences on the school-to-work transition and work-education collaboration processes. The project has been quite successful in its attempt to bring leaders from the educational, business, and community sectors together and to help those sectors deal more effectively with youth transition issues. Another key part of the consortium project was the Information Exchange Service (IES). Since its inception, the IES has helped stimulate the development of local work education councils by maintaining a clearinghouse of information and technical assistance resources on work-education initiatives. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228392

THE WORK-EDUCATION CONSORTIUM PROJECT:

A REPORT ON THE FIRST TWO YEARS

(U.S. Department of Labor
Contract No. 99-6-653-42-3)

National Institute for Work and Learning
1302 18th Street, NW Suite 501 Washington, DC 20036

CE 035258

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Lepinto

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1978

CONTENTS

Summary

A. Purpose of the Report i
B. Capsule History of the Contract ii
C. The Consortium Project and the Councils in March 1978 iv
D. Observations on Consortium Progress vii
E. Information Exchange Service and Other Technical Assistance .. ix

I. History of the Contract and Its Purposes 1

II. The Consortium Project and the Councils After Two Years 4

A. Growth of the Consortium 4
B. Growth of Local Councils 10

1. Formation and Selection of Councils 10
2. Characteristics of Consortium Councils 13

C. Observations on Consortium Progress 39

III. Information Exchange Service and Other Technical Assistance 44

A. Information Exchange Service 44
B. Technical Assistance and Liaison with the Consortium 52

IV. Directions for the Next Project Year 55

A. Technical Assistance Services to Work-Education Consortium Communities 55
B. Services to Other Interested Communities and Agencies 58
C. Intermediary/Representational Functions 60
D. Subcontract Management Functions 61

SUMMARY

A. Purpose of the Report

This is the final report of the National Manpower Institute's Work-Education Consortium Project under Department of Labor Contract 99-6-653-42-8. It summarizes two years of efforts by a nationwide collaborative of 21 community work-education councils, the National Manpower Institute, and the federal government.

This is also a status report on an idea in progress. The idea of community work-education councils was proposed in The Boundless Resource in 1975 as a mechanism for bringing local leadership and institutions to focus their interests, resources, and collaborative efforts on the critical transition of youth between education and work. With initial funding from the Department of Labor and support from the Interagency Steering Committee on Education and Work, and with the even more crucial assent and voluntary participation of hundreds of local leaders, that idea is now well into the test of real world resources and institutional relationships.

Because another year of federal support has been provided for the Consortium Project, this is not a final report on the local councils or the Consortium. The project's two-year life thus far has consisted of a first year during which information was dispersed, applications reviewed, and sites selected; and a second year during which the 21 councils -- many of them newly formed -- participated actively in the Work-Education Consortium.

While the Work-Education Consortium Project refers to this group of 21 councils associated with the National Manpower Institute (NMI), the Consortium itself also includes six community councils sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC); five local councils sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB); and the State of New Jersey's Work, Education and Leisure Initiative. This report principally reviews the progress during the past year of those 21 councils associated with NMI's direct technical assistance role. The report also reviews NMI's two years of work in organizing the national Consortium, in

providing technical assistance to the 21 community councils, and in establishing and operating the project's Information Exchange Service (IES). The IES has been the principal means by which information about Consortium activities and about other conferences, publications, and legislation affecting youth transition programs has been disseminated to several thousand persons interested in the progress of the project.

B. Capsule History of the Contract

The Work-Education Consortium Project formally began with the signing of the project contract on March 3, 1976. Including a 2-month extension of that contract, the project covers a 26-month period that ended on May 2, 1978. The overall objective of this contract has been that of:

> increasing collaboration at the community level among education institutions, employment institutions, and the public in bringing about a smoother transition from school to work, and from youth to economic adulthood.

To help implement this objective, NMI, working in consultation with the Interagency Steering Committee (composed of representatives from the Departments of Labor; Health, Education and Welfare; and Commerce), was expected to "facilitate the establishment of a network identified as the Work-Education Consortium." In part, this responsibility included assisting localities in "mobilizing resources available throughout the community" for the end purpose of "bringing youth into adulthood."

During the second year of the NMI-DOL contract, the communities participating in the Consortium were each awarded separate contracts by the Department of Labor. The 21 council-DOL contracts represented "seed money" to be used during an initial period of start-up planning and demonstration. The criteria for project success included by definition the eventual mobilization of community and other resources needed to sustain councils.

The history of the project is rooted in President Gerald Ford's Ohio State University speech of 1974 in which the President announced the formation of an Interagency Task Force on Education and Work consisting of

the Secretaries of the Departments of Labor; Commerce; and Health, Education and Welfare. The interagency interest in problems of youth transition was stimulated, in part, by proposals emanating from the National Manpower Institute that local education-work councils could be a mechanism for involving major sectors of communities, and of the nation, in focusing thinking and resources on education and work issues affecting young people.

The Work-Education Consortium Project resulted from this convergence of concern and desire for a testing of the council idea in the context of real community experience. Many aspects of the education-work councils proposed in The Boundless Resource raised further questions. These questions ranged from the broad to the specific.

- Would the project be a test of the capacity of local communities to handle their own affairs in our highly institutional society?
- Would the project be a test of the ability of three large federal bureaucracies to develop and implement a plan calling for their shared responsibility and sustained interest?
- Would the use of a private contractor as an intermediary between the federal agencies and the local councils encourage local initiative and participation in the project?
- Would the formation of a Consortium of local councils increase the range, quality, and intensity of collaboration within the communities?
- Would the process of local collaboration result in the creation of agendas for substantive actions, the establishment of priorities, and the effective implementation of those agendas to impact on youth transition problems?

During the first year of the project, intensive efforts were made to identify local communities where leadership groups were interested in participating in the demonstration project. Working with national associations and organizations of many types, attending conferences, seeking the widest possible audience, NMI sought out such communities. In a few instances, prototype examples of councils were identified. But in no case did these nascent councils embody the breadth of collaboration or the complex awareness of interrelated problems and resources that had been envisioned by

NMI. Communities were selected for Consortium membership because of the varying examples they offered of leadership sources, stages of development of collaborative processes, size of community, and complexity of the local labor market; as well as for overall geographic distribution.

The central problem addressed by the Consortium Project, therefore, was to help raise the level of understanding of youth transition issues and problems and to help redefine and improve the effectiveness and replicability of possible local responses. Stated another way, the project was designed to give solid, experientially proven meaning to the term "community collaboration," as applied to the general problems associated with youth transition from school to work.

The contract for the Consortium Project is unusual in that in addition to the responsibilities borne by NMI, and ultimately by the local councils, the federal government specified for itself "a companion approach to be implemented primarily through the interdepartmental steering group." This federal responsibility, described only briefly as facilitating local collaboration by working through "existing organizational structures," was included to indicate the intention of the government to set an example at the federal level of the type of collaboration called for at the local level.

C. The Consortium Project and the Councils in March 1977

One year after the signing of the DOL-NMI contract, the core structures of the project were in place. The communities had been selected by the Interagency Steering Committee. The 21 local councils were themselves either formed or in the process of being formed. The first Consortium meeting was planned for early April 1977. Councils either had hired executive directors, were awaiting the signing of federal contracts prior to hiring, or were anticipating such hiring once basic planning activities were completed. The Information Exchange Service had begun publication of the project's newsletter, The Work-Education Exchange. Very quickly following the start of the second year, the Consortium itself took shape at the April meeting. All but a few council-DOL contracts were signed in April and May 1977.

During the contract year April 1977 to March 1978, the Consortium continued to develop in its two crucial aspects: organization and program.

Organizationally, new councils formalized their memberships and structures, while existing councils frequently found through the project a need to broaden and balance their membership base and to strengthen the policy and planning responsibilities of their boards of directors or equivalent committees. Several of the councils quickly sought local CETA positions to provide additional staff support for the council. For all councils, whether previously existing or new, the chief organizational challenges of the first Consortium year were to clarify the respective responsibilities of members and council directors, and to decide how the concept of collaboration could be most effectively implemented with the limited resources available.

The memberships of the councils reflected the initial interest found in sectors of the communities. Over 50 percent of the almost 500 members of all local councils came from the education and employment sectors. Another 25 percent came from labor and government. About 10 percent represented volunteer service agencies. Youth members represented about 2 percent of all council members. Yet in all but one unique instance, that of the Jamestown, New York Labor-Management Committee, at least five community sectors were represented on every local council.

Most of the councils began working early toward a status as independent, not-for-profit, tax-exempt corporations. Among the seven councils established prior to March 1976, four had been incorporated before their inclusion in the project. Seven other councils have since incorporated, and several others intend to do so. Several councils sponsored by independent community-based organizations have not yet seen a need for separation from those parent organizations.

Programmatically, the councils moved into a number of program areas, employing an extremely varied array of strategies and techniques. Attachment A (The Work-Education Consortium: An Inventory of Projects in Progress) provides brief descriptions of over 100 current and completed activities undertaken by Consortium councils during the 1977-78 project year. The scope of these interests is reflected by the descriptive titles for those activities:

- Survey of Business for a Community Resource Directory
- Community Volunteer Network
- Clearinghouse for Employer Resources
- Catalog of Career Education Programs -- Public, Parochial and Independent
- Employability Workshops for Students
- Vocational Exploration and Job Exposure Program
- "Project Business" for Eighth and Ninth Graders
- Field Experience Education Program
- Computerized Career Information Program
- Examination of the Responsiveness of Employment Service Agencies to "Difficult to Place" Youth
- Accessing a State-wide Occupational Information System at the Local Level
- Occupational Awareness Courses for Teachers
- Summer Work Experience for High School Counselors
- Development of a Labor-Management Curriculum
- Public Workshop on YEDPA
- Development of Linkages Among Community Groups Impacting Youth
- Council Representation on YEDPA Youth Council
- Forum on Apprenticeship Issues
- Identification of Existing Youth Transition Services and Unmet Service Needs
- State-wide Conference on the Work-Education Collaborative Process
- Regional Conference on the School-to-Work Transition
- Development of a Youth Employment Charter
- Conference on New Job Opportunities for Youth in Energy-Related Fields
- Committee on the Employment of Handicapped Individuals
- Assessment of GED Tutoring and Testing in Philadelphia

Inevitably, pursuit of these activities -- whether on a formal project basis or on a less exclusive brokering basis -- has brought council staffs and members into contact with many other local,area-wide, state, regional, and national organizations.

D. Observations on Consortium Progress

The critical question posed by The Boundless Resource was whether

> the real community is now ready to stand up -- not just to be counted, but also to take a large part again in handling its own affairs. (p. 64)

The youth transition problem was seen as particularly suitable for testing this question. Local institutions -- schools, colleges, employers, unions, local private and public human resource agencies, local and state government officials -- are ultimately responsible (by action or default) for the quality of transitional programs. While national priorities and resources may determine the scale of such activities, the principal factors involved -- youth, jobs, education and training opportunities, and job alternatives -- are unavoidably present and must be matched at the local level.

With modest funding on a per community basis, (approximately $40,000 per community) the Work-Education Consortium Project was intended to bring leaders from those critical community sectors together to think through their shared responsibilities, to analyze available resources, and to take actions that would make institutions and people in those sectors more effective in dealing with youth transition issues.

The intensive learning experience of the past two years has served in its broader aspects to confirm several key considerations in the planning of the project. These findings are not offered as definitive conclusions, but rather as interim observations for further testing.

- The independent status of the councils has been an invaluable asset in permitting them to broker relationships between major community sectors and to initiate activities of their own.

- The variety of interests and local conditions has reconfirmed the value of looking at councils as implementors of a process of shared responsibility (collaboration) among community interests rather than as being tied to specific technical approaches.

- Similarly, the ability of councils to work out their own understanding and practice of community collaboration has resulted in differing approaches to council organization and membership, differing expectations of council missions within a community, differing levels of involvement of

non-members in council activities, and differing senses of how to exercise leadership in dealing with other community institutions. Organizational flexibility has created many variations on a common theme and thereby helped to define the real world meaning and potential of local collaboration.

- The ability of a full-time council staff director to solicit ideas, identify and develop community skills and resources, conceptualize strategies, and assure that council members and others are involved in the development of those strategies has been essential to council progress during the first year.

- Institutional changes are occurring in Consortium communities, not simply because councils exist but because personal and institutional interests desire change. Councils have been able to be catalysts and brokers for some of these changes.

- Membership in a national project has stimulated the interest and seriousness of council members in dealing with youth transition problems and in perceiving some of the relationships between these problems and other economic and social issues.

- The federal government strategy of "seed money" funding for councils appears to have been appropriate. It is doubtful if half the councils would now exist but for the project. Yet, the necessity for locally developed funding strategies is clearly putting pressure on councils to define and achieve levels of meaningful performance.

- The involvement in the project of NMI as an intermediary organization appears to have been highly satisfactory. NMI's dual role of representing Consortium council needs at the federal level and of providing information and an analytical perspective at the local level appears to have found appropriate levels of trust and assistance.

- The relationships that have evolved between Consortium councils and CETA prime sponsors have been in the main constructive and supportive. Given the many points at which their interests conceivably diverge, the actual extent of constructive interaction and support is both noteworthy and instructive.

E. Information Exchange Service and Other Technical Assistance

The Information Exchange Service (IES) was designed to help stimulate the development of local work-education councils by maintaining a clearinghouse of information and technical assistance resources on work-education initiatives.

It was anticipated that the Exchange Service would serve the Consortium communities in an intensive way, providing them with information packets several times a month, with analyses of policy and legislative issues, and with specific information on request. The Consortium staff would also organize conferences and workshops for particpant communities, with the Information Exchange assuming administrative responsibility.

To serve the many people who contacted NMI during the site selection process and those who learned of the Consortium as it developed, the IES would provide a free newsletter and respond to individual requests for information from the clearinghouse to the greatest extent possible.

IES accomplishments over the last two years have been in six major activity areas:

- Conferences and Workshops: The IES has provided administrative and agenda-building support for six conferences and workshops held during the second year of the contract.
- Information Mailouts: The IES has provided Consortium councils with fact sheets and regular information packets on a wide variety of topics ranging from federal education and work policy papers, legislative summaries, funding opportunities, and grantsmanship newsletters, to descriptions of exemplary local CETA, career education, and other programs.
- Publications: The IES has coordinated the preparation, publication, and dissemination of six project-related papers.
- The Consortium Newsletter, The Work-Education Exchange: The IES has published five issues of the Exchange during the last 14 months. A sixth is now in press. The mailing list for the newsletter has grown from almost 2,000 to more than 5,000 names. The list is computerized to facilitate special mailings to target audiences.

- Central Collection on Education-Work Initiatives: The Information Exchange Service has supervised the ongoing collection, organization, and processing of information and technical assistance resources from local, state, and national organizations. The Service maintains detailed files on each of the Consortium communities, including the AACJC, NAB, and New Jersey projects; descriptive and technical assistance materials received from communities across the county; materials on federal government agencies; and on national and regional organizations concerned with youth development and employment.

- Outreach and Dissemination: Throughout the two-year project, the Information Exchange Service has provided project information to the media, to other national organizations, and to interested local groups and individuals. As interest in youth transition issues has increased over the past two years, requests for information about the collaborative council concept and about the Work-Education Consortium Project have increased.

Direct technical assistance to Consortium councils by NMI program officers and staff began during the first year's site selection process and continued on an expanded basis throughout the second year. This assistance has ranged from site visits by NMI staff, to the gathering of specialized materials and the brokering of information from Washington-based organizations, to frequent telephone conversations concerning analysis of local council projects and plans.

Brokering efforts have resulted in meetings, the exchange of technical assistance, and the development of new relationships among Consortium members and between Consortium members and others. Many new contacts have been made in the course of collecting information and identifying resource people for the six WECP conferences and workshops. These contacts were made with federal and state government agencies, national youth service agencies, and local organizations.

Among Consortium members, NMI has brokered technical assistance visits, thus maximizing the expertise that exists within the Consortium. A good example of intra-Consortium brokering was NMI's cosponsoring, with the Mid-

Michigan Community Action Council, of the conference on "Work-Education Councils and Rural Conditions." This conference was a response to an expressed need of the rural councils to meet with each other and with resource people from outside the Consortium to address issues that are unique to the rural situation.

I. History of the Contract and Its Purposes

In August 1974, on the occasion of his first major address since taking office, President Gerald Ford chose education, and specifically the intertwined relationships of work and education, as the topic of his address at Ohio State University:

> I have asked the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor, and HEW to report to me new ways to bring the world of work and the institution of education closer together. For your government as well as you, the time has come for a fusion of the realities of a work-a-day life with the teaching of academic institutions.

To implement this initiative, the President established an Interagency Task Force on Education and Work. This task force was the predecessor of the Federal Interagency Steering Committee on Education and Work.

Concurrent with this chain of events at the federal level, the National Manpower Institute was involved in the preparation and publication (in the fall of 1975) of The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy. In the Prospectus it was recommended that community education-work councils be established at the local level to increase collaboration among education institutions, the employment sector, and the public with the aim of effecting a smoother transition for youth from formal education to the work world.

Upon publication of The Boundless Resource, the Federal Interagency Steering Committee's interest was stimulated by the book's suggestion that local education-work councils could be a mechanism for involving major sectors of communities and of the nation in focusing thinking and resources on education and work issues affecting young people.

On March 3, 1976, the National Manpower Institute was awarded a two-year contract (later extended by two months to an end date of May 3, 1978)

by the U.S. Department of Labor. With oversight by the Federal Interagency Steering Committee, NMI was to assist in the establishment of a network of communities which, working through local education-work councils, would serve as demonstration sites to test out the effectiveness of the council approach.

The Work-Education Consortium Project has consisted of three phases:

- Phase I -- Initial identification of 15 communities (later revised to 21) (March - June 1976)
- Phase II -- Information-gathering, analysis, and recommendation of communities to the Interagency Steering Committee (July - December 1976)
- Phase III -- Technical assistance-liaison with Consortium communities and information exchange activities with organizations and individuals interested in the project (January 1977 - April 1978).

For the first ten months of the contract, efforts were concentrated on Phases I and II: laying the groundwork for the Consortium through initial site identification, analysis and recommendation, building linkages and communications between the project and other interested parties, and developing internal NMI policies concerning options for the implementation of the project. Phase III activities did overlap here, however, as NMI technical assistance began for some communities in the form of organizational and planning aid before their selection to the Consortium. By the end of December 1977, the Institute had recommended twenty communities and one state-wide initiative to the Interagency Steering Committee for inclusion in the Consortium.

As of late March 1977, all twenty-one sites had been accepted into the project by the Committee. An initial Consortium meeting was held in early April to give the community representatives a chance to get together and exchange information on their activities. Subsequent meetings during

the second year of the contract served the same general linkage-building purpose while focusing on such topics as current legislative developments in the youth employment area, the special problems of urban versus rural communities, and identification of specific issue areas for technical assistance concentration. A major effort of the Institute during the second year was the expansion and strengthening of the project's Information Exchange Service in order to increase written communication between Consortium communities and NMI; and with national organizations, federal and state agencies, and individuals interested in keeping up with project developments. The activities of the Information Exchange Service are further detailed later in this report.

At the community level, councils became operational, identifying areas of need concerning local education-work interactions and beginning to either develop policies or implement programs directed at youth transition issues. During Phase III NMI's technical assistance to councils was concentrated on direct on-site assistance, discerning locally critical issues, and helping to build linkages between communities and various sources of financial and informational support.

Current efforts, as the project approaches the end of its initial contract, are focused on preparation for third year activities (second year activities for the Consortium).

II. The Consortium Project and the Councils After Two Years

The objective of the contract, and the project, has been to "increase collaboration at the community level" by involving local institutions in "a network identified as the Work-Education Consortium" for the broad purpose of "bringing about a smoother transition from school to work and from youth to economic adulthood."

Has the objective of the contract been achieved? This section of the report describes in some detail the events that have occurred during the past two years as a result of this contract. The section is divided into three parts:

- Growth of the Consortium: describing the organization and development of the "network" called for by the contract;
- Growth of the local councils: describing in a summarized form the principal impacts and problems of local councils during the period of their membership in the Consortium;
- Observations on Consortium progress: providing brief commentary on some of the project's critical expectations after two years of experience.

A. Growth of the Consortium

The Work-Education Consortium Project (WECP) was already one year old in April 1977, when the recently selected communities first met as a Consortium. Together with the AACJC, NAB, and State of New Jersey projects, and members of the Interagency Steering Committee on Education and Work, representatives from the 21 community councils sponsored by NMI met in Columbia, Maryland, to learn more about each other and to better define their expectations of what the project hoped to achieve.

The principal objective of that first meeting was to establish a Consortium "identity" among the group of participating communities and the national organizations. It was generally assumed, but by no means guaranteed at that point, that this group of local councils, sponsoring intermediary organizations, and interested federal representatives would have at least two years of core support from the Department of Labor during which to demonstrate the feasibility and desirability of local collaborative councils taking leadership in local youth transition planning and programming. Each selected council sponsored by NMI was to have its own annual funding contract with the Department of Labor. These contracts had not yet been signed at the time of the first Consortium meeting.

The Consortium was organized to facilitate the flow of communication among all its members during this period of organization and demonstration. No ideal type or types of local councils were proposed. The general concept of local collaborative councils had been sketched out by the Institute, and educational and manpower literature was full of analyses of aspects of youth transition problems and possible solutions. The task of learning if and how local collaborative councils could affect the problems of youth transition -- would require both pragmatism in working with the interests of community institutions, and, imagination in defining ways to bring those intersts together. Many individual members of the Consortium were themselves knowledgeable about the history and current status of these problems and solutions in their own communities. The sharing of perceptions, strategies, and organizational tactics by these individuals was immediately recognized as a major contribution of the Consortium to the confidence and insight with which each council approached its task.

The secondary objective of the first Consortium meeting was to set in motion the mutual support processes that would characterize Consortium relations over the term of the project:

- Initiate the process of networking and sharing of information between and among Consortium communities, NMI staff, and federal officials;
- Plan short- and long-term Consortium activities (e.g., identify, define, and prioritize technical assistance needs and inventory technical assistance capabilities);
- Provide immediate technical assistance on a select number of issues of common concern (e.g., technicalities of contract administration and monitoring);
- Make the Consortium communities aware of support(information, funding, etc.) that could be gained through the overall Federal Education-Work Initiative;
- Help feed back to the Federal Interagency Steering Committee problems, needs and perceptions of Consortium communities.

Judging by the comments received informally at the meeting itself, and formally in meeting evaluations received by NMI following the meeting, these relatively modest objectives were more than achieved.

Consortium members met again at workshops and conferences planned by NMI in consultation with council members and directors on six occasions during the contract year. These meetings were:

- Regional workshops for council directors: Belmont, Maryland, and Snow Bird, Utah, July 1977;
- Workshop on the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA): Washington, D.C., September 1977;
- Conference on the Agencies of Work-Education Councils: Portland, Oregon, November, 1977.
- Conference on Work-Education Councils and Rural Conditions: Alma, Michigan, November 1977;
- Work-Education Consortium conference, annual meeting: Kiawah Island (Charleston), South Carolina, February 1978.
- Work-Education Consortium Directors' meeting: Washington, D.C., April 1978.

The purposes of these meetings varied. For example, the regional meetings in July 1977, served to introduce the national project to those seven directors who had taken their positions subsequent to the April meeting and, as importantly, to focus on those "nuts and bolts" issues of council development and project management of special concern to council staff. Even at this point, just three months into their project year, the directors were able to compare the great variety of management styles and programmatic approaches being tested by the councils. Finding the progress of the Consortium Project sufficiently healthy at this early stage, NMI was able to collect the information that went into the September 1977 publication of Work-Education Councils: Profiles of 21 Collaborative Efforts (Attachment B).

In similar fashion other Consortium meetings focused on NMI's responsibilities for information dissemination and the local councils' needs for conceptual sustenance and technical information. The YEDPA workshop enabled some councils to take leadership roles in local development of programs and policies requiring joint CETA-LEA (Local Education Agency) responsibilities. Other councils found themselves better prepared to decide how, when, and why to involve themselves with the new legislation in particular and with CETA in general. The Portland meeting was designed to stimulate thinking about and provide visible case examples of youth transition activities organized at the local level. These meetings also provided information and insights that NMI later translated into project publications. (See Attachments C, D, and E: Collaborative Process Building for Local Implementation of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977; Work and Service Experience for Youth; and A Charter for Improved Rural Youth Transition.)

Project workshops and conferences attended by a relatively small group of people with similar interests and experiences obviously can have an impact over time of strengthening the ties among those individuals. Having a positive impact assumes that the Institute staff, the members and staff of the local councils, and the federal representatives share understanding of each others' situations and capabilities and are able to make these events serve multiple purposes. The responses received by NMI from participants in all these events indicate that this spirit of understanding and joint responsibility has been a continuing strength of the Consortium Project. Presumably, some portion of this strength can be traced back to the year-long process used to identify and recommend communities for participation in the Consortium. This process enabled NMI to get behind the veneer of proposals and initial representations. It allowed NMI to identify competent individuals prepared to lead in the development of local councils, individuals committed both to the collaborative approach to solving youth transition problems and to the national collaboration signified by the project.

The communication and support network which is the Consortium has grown to extend well beyond periodic group meetings. Telephones and letters have been used extensively by council directors, and at times by council members, to communicate with each other. Staff of the Institute are in weekly and even daily telephone contact with council directors. Site visits by NMI staff to Consortium communities, by council members and staff to other councils, and occasionally by council staff and members to Washington, D.C., all have contributed to a widespread and in-depth awareness of Consortium activities. The mailouts provided almost weekly by the project's Information Exchange Service also reinforce the networking of Consortium

members. Finally, NMI is routinely in touch with the federal representatives, as are the council directors on a less frequent basis.

Some indication of the volume and purposes of local council interaction with Consortium and non-Consortium sources can be found in the councils' quarterly reports to NMI. These self-reports of site visits and other communications between councils tend to understate the level of interaction because of the informality of these communications and the lack of standardized recordkeeping procedures. NMI program officers, for example, are frequently aware of intra-Consortium activities that are not reported in the quarterly reports.

Allowing for this caveat, it is safe to say that intra-Consortium contacts increased at geometric rates during the nine months following the first Consortium conference. At the same time, actual site visits between councils have been relatively few in number, not up to the level of inter-community visits anticipated by local councils or by NMI in initial projections.

At the time of formal initiation of the Consortium in April 1977, communications between councils were non-existent. From this point, communication levels rose during the first quarter to 14 councils reporting contacts with other Consortium councils. By the third quarter, all 21 councils had either initiated or received contacts from other councils during the quarter. In some instances, this contact was relatively superficial (e.g., sent or received a newsletter). In other cases, contacts were initiated for purposes directly related to the specific skills or experiences of the various councils.

In sum, the growth of the Work-Education Consortium can be measured in many ways: in volume of interaction, in spirit of collaboration, in joint activities of particular types. The comments above have sketched a portrait based primarily on the more tangible interactions. The Institute has not attempted to measure attitudes or interests in any systematic sense. That spirit of collaboration does exist, however, and can be witnessed in the high quality and seriousness of the daily "give and take" and responsiveness to needs that exist between the local councils, the National Manpower Institute, the Department of Labor, and the other federal representatives.

B. Growth of Local Councils

1. Formation and Selection of Councils

Within two weeks of the April 1977 Consortium meeting, the first group of DOL-local council contracts was signed. One month later all but a few contracts were in effect, and by mid-June, all 21 councils were receiving federal funds.

Of the 21 Consortium councils, only seven had been in existence prior to initiation of the Institute's search for Consortium communities. Of these only six had received any prior funding and only four were incorporated as private not-for-profit educational organizations before March 1976. In effect, the opportunity to participate in the Work-Education Consortium Project was the stimulus for the formal organization of 14 local councils.

Where councils already existed, the council director or a leading member had been the individual responding to NMI's announcements of the

Consortium selection process. In other instances, the responses to NMI had come from one or more sectors of the community. In a few cases, local leaders, having read The Boundless Resource (published some six months earlier), had already set out to organize local councils with the kind of representative membership, agenda, and leadership mission outlined in that book. In some cases, these local leaders had contacted the Institute after reading the book and were aware that funding for a national demonstration project was being sought by NMI.

In the majority of the cases, however, communities had neither specific knowledge of the project nor an existing council structure. It remained for those responding to NMI's call for inquiries to demonstrate their ability, and their community's ability, during the time remaining in the selection phase of the project, to pull together the institutional and leadership components of a credible local council. Where effective local leadership was forthcoming and where the eventual formation of a viable work-education council (by whatever name) seemed likely, the officers and staff of the National Manpower Institute made every effort to provide information and to assist in the catalyzing and brokering process. The 50 site visits made by NMI staff, consequently, were designed to help strengthen local collaborative efforts to improve youth transition services as much as they were designed to gather objective information for the eventual selection process.

At all times during the first year's project information dissemination and community data collection phases, the Institute downplayed reference to the availability of federal financial support. This was done

to emphasize the importance of local leadership support for and involvement in council activities.

In its role as an intermediary organization during the site selection stage, NMI's objectives were to:

- Emphasize the serious intent of NMI and the federal government to test and demonstrate in a variety of settings the feasibility of the local collaborative council concept;
- Observe "in action" the thinking, relationships, and leadership skills of the individuals who were expected to provide leadership for local councils during the term of the project;
- Develop expectations regarding such essential issues as: which sectors of the community were most committed to, or most needed to participate in, a collaborative venture of this kind; what potential local sources of financial and non-financial support might be available to a work-education council; what policy directions and activities might be most profitably pursued;
- Demonstrate a legitimate need for more information about the community;
- Demonstrate the quality and types of skills which NMI staff would bring to the project.

The original contract between the Department of Labor and the National Manpower Institute called for eventual selection of up to fifteen communities, the actual selection to be determined by the Interagency Steering Committee. In the final event, 21 councils (20 local communities and the California statewide council) were selected by the Committee.

The Institute's experiences in working with local communities during the first year were documented in summary form in earlier quarterly reports and in the various community files and site review reports prepared at the

The principal purpose of the above comments is to demonstrate that NMI has been intimately involved in the growth and development of the Consortium councils, in many cases from their inception, and in all cases -- because of the nature of the recommendation/selection procedures -- prior to the actual formation of the Consortium in April 1977. The degree of involvement in and the impact of that early contact varied greatly from place to place. It would be a matter of conjecture to try to specify consequences now. By April 1977, however, the Consortium existed, the 21 members had been selected, 13 of the 21 were organized as formal councils, and the remaining eight were well into the process of involving their communities in council-building activities and thinking.

2. Characteristics of Consortium Councils

The 21 Consortium communities represent a wide assortment of geographic, demographic, economic, sociological, and political conditions. The selection criteria included these community and regional characteristics as well as organizational characteristics such as leadership and scope of existing and potential councils. Extended description and analysis of community and council characteristics as of July 1977, can be found in the NMI publication Work-Education Councils: Profiles of 21 Collaborative Efforts (Attachment B).

The purpose of this section is first to summarize very briefly some of those council descriptors and local council environments. The second, and more important purpose, is to summarize the progress the councils have made toward credibility as institutions involving community leaders from many sectors in initiatives to improve education-work transition services for young people.

Geographic Distribution

Geographic distribution was one factor in the selection of communities to participate in the Work-Education Consortium Project. The project was intended to be a national demonstration, visible to interested persons throughout the nation. Table I shows the distribution of councils by the ten federal regions. It is evident from this table that the 21 councils are somewhat clustered in the northeast, central, and western sections of the country. The clustering of Consortium councils generally corresponds to the regional distribution of initial inquiries about the project. NMI made special efforts to encourage communities in the southeastern and south-central regions to submit necessary information. The time allowed for project Phases I and II was simply insufficient for extended participation by NMI in the local discussions required to generate essential community information. NMI officers and staff perceived, however, that a more open-ended period of information-sharing and institutional brokering involving an external third party would eventually have resulted in substantial representation from many of these communities. In other words, Table I can be read to indicate that while the concept and practice of community collaborative councils -- for youth transition and other community-wide purposes -- were more readily adopted in some parts of the country, no evidence has been found to indicate that youth transition councils are inappropriate anywhere else.

Community Size

Variations in the size of the communities and in the complexity of the labor markets served by Consortium councils were also important factors in council selection. Table II categorizes these areas by six types: statewide,

TABLE I

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF CONSORTIUM COUNCILS BY FEDERAL DOL REGIONS

REGION 1

Bethel, Maine
Worcester, Massachusetts

REGION 2

Buffalo, New York
Jamestown, New York
New York, New York

REGION 3

Erie, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Wheeling, West Virginia

REGION 4

Charleston, South Carolina
Lexington, Kentucky
Martin County, North Carolina

REGION 5

Chicago Heights, Illinois
Gratiot County, Michigan
Livonia, Michigan
Peoria - Pekin Area, Illinois

REGION 6

None

REGION 7

None

REGION 8

Sioux Falls, South Dakota

REGION 9

State of California
Mesa, Arizona
Oakland, California

REGION 10

Portland, Oregon
Seattle, Washington

Table II

AREAS SERVED BY CONSORTIUM COUNCILS

State-Wide (1)	Urban (5)	Rural (4)	Urban/Rural (4)	Suburban (3)	Urban/Suburban (4)
State of California	New York, NY	Bethel, ME	Jamestown, NY	Chicago Heights, IL	Buffalo, NY
	Oakland, CA	Gratiot County, MI	Lexington, KY	Livonia, MI	Charleston, SC
	Philadelphia, PA	Martin County, NC	E. Peoria, IL	Mesa, AZ	Erie, PA
	Portland, OR	Sioux Falls, SD	Wheeling, WV		Worcester, MA
	Seattle, WA				

urban, rural, urban/rural, suburban, and urban/suburban. Variations by unemployment rate and average family income, by demographic make-up (e.g., median age and racial/ethnic mix) were also found and considered but were not included in the contract as decisive factors. Information on these issues can be found in the individual community summaries contained in Profiles of 21 Collaborative Efforts. In point of fact, commonalities among the actual experiences of Consortium councils -- recognizing from the first, the major local variations in that experience -- can be highlighted when grouped along a broad community size/type dimension such as rural, urban, suburban.

Rural councils, for example, clearly need to help each other define proper roles of education-work councils in rural areas because of their less diverse economic and institutional base, because of the isolating impact of transportation and communication patterns in rural areas, and because of persistent misconceptions shaping the ways national and state policy-making deals with rural areas.

Critical Dates in Formal Organization

Differences in the stage of development of existing collaborative processes was a major emphasis in the contract's specification of council selection criteria.

As shown by Table III, these differences were as basic as the existence or non-existence of a local council in a specific community. Only one-third of the Consortium communities had formed councils prior to the award of the contract to NMI. Moreover, even those councils had substantially differing missions, membership composition, and access to resources. Some, such as the Industry Education Council of California,

TABLE III

CRITICAL DATES IN FORMAL ORGANIZATION OF CONSORTIUM COMMUNITIES

Councils Established Prior to March 1976	Organized	First Major Funding	Executive Director Hired	By-laws Adopted	Incorporated	Tax-Exempt Status Received
Buffalo, NY	3/73	73	3/73	6/74	5/74	7/76
California, State of	1/74	2/74	1/74	9/73	11/73	11/73
East Peoria, IL	8/72	5/74	5/74	5/73	11/72	1/74
Gratiot County, MI	1/74	9/75	6/74	6/74	6/74	4/75
Jamestown, NY	2/72	5/73	5/73	----	----*	----*
Livonia, MI	5/74	4/77	4/77	1/77	1/77	3/77
Worcester, MA	4/75	6/75	6/75	5/77	8/77	1/78
Councils Established April 1976 - March 1977						
Charleston, SC	12/76	5/77	6/77	----	----	----
Chicago Heights, IL	9/76	4/77	5/77	1/77	6/77	----
Erie, PA	12/76	4/77	8/77	8/77	7/77	----
Martin County, NC	2/77	4/77	7/77	9/77	9/77	----
New York, NY	9/76	4/77	8/77	----	----*	----*
Oakland, CA	12/76	7/76	3/77	----	----	----
Wheeling, WV	11/76	4/77	4/77	11/77	12/77	----
Councils Established Following April 1977 WECP Meeting						
Bethel, ME	7/77	4/77	8/77	10/77	12/77	----
Lexington, KY	5/77	5/77	5/77	6/77	----	----
Mesa, AZ	4/77	5/77	7/77	----	----*	----*
Philadelphia, PA	5/77	5/77	5/77	----	----*	----*
Portland, OR	8/77	4/77	5/77	10/77	----	----
Seattle, WA	8/77	6/77	8/77	----	----*	----*
Sioux Falls, SD	6/77	4/77	4/77	----	----*	----*

* - Under aegis of another organization.

had policy and program catalyzing missions. Others, such as the Buffalo and East Peoria councils, had been established to be direct providers and coordinators of supplementary educational services. Still others, such as the Livonia and Worcester councils, were organized initially as forums for discussions about how private employers (participating as members of the Chamber of Commerce) could support the career education programs of the local public schools. In one case, Jamestown, the council had no prior involvement with youth transition issues, having been organized under city government-labor-management sponsorship to deal with issues of industrial productivity and quality of working life.

As noted earlier, the Consortium Project was itself a significant impetus to council formation. The project articulated a mission (improving local institutional responsiveness to youth transition problems), a method (the collaborative process), and a mechanism (local education-work councils). New councils were initiated, and exiting councils reviewed their purposes, activities, and membership.

Most councils also began working toward a status as independent, not-for-profit, tax-exempt corporations. Independent status for councils was one of the key structural characteristics recommended by NMI on the assumption that a lack of that status could eventually compromise the ability of councils to provide community-wide leadership. The corresponding risk was that independence might separate a council from the power of an established institutional base. The challenge of independence would be to find other ways -- through membership, interest brokering, and programmatic initiatives -- to gain access to institutional power on an "as needed" basis.

Consequently, organizational independence was not a strict criteria for Consortium membership but rather an important issue to be analyzed by each council and handled with an approach appropriate to each community situation. Among the seven councils established prior to March 1976, four had incorporated and several others intended to do so. Several councils sponsored by independent community-based organizations have not yet seen a need for separation from those parent organizations.

By the middle of the first Consortium year (October 1977), all the councils were organized, had members, officers, and a paid director. Quarterly reports for this period indicate that 14 councils had received additional funds (the range was from $1,000 to $55,000) from non-project sources.

Twelve months after the first Consortium meeting, this process of initiation and self-review is continuing. Some councils are still working toward independence and incorporation, others are still inclined to see their futures tied to an institutional base. Several of the older councils have broadened their membership, revised their bylaws and branched out into new areas of community involvement. Table III is a good guide to the quantitative growth of Consortium councils during the contract period but should not be read as a guide to an understanding of qualitative maturity.

Sources of Leadership

Table IV indicates the initial local sources of leadership for community participation in the Consortium Project. Education, both secondary and postsecondary, and business/industry were clearly the two prime movers. These were the sectors that either initiated discussions with NMI or made

Table IV

PRIMARY SOURCES OF INITIAL LEADERSHIP OF COUNCIL FORMATION

(A community may be listed under more than one sector)

College/Community College	Public Schools/ Career Ed	City Gov't/CETA	Business/ Industry	Social Service Agencies	Community Action	Labor
Chicago Heights, IL	Bethel, ME	Lexington, KY	Buffalo, NY	Erie, PA	Gratiot County, MI	Jamestown, NY
Oakland, CA	Buffalo, NY	Jamestown, NY	IECC			
Wheeling, WV	Livonia, MI	Portland, OR	Jamestown, NY			
Sioux Falls, SC	Mesa, AZ		New York, NY			
Charleston, SC	Philadelphia, PA		East Peoria, IL			
Erie, PA	Worcester, MA		Portland, OR			
Lexington, KY			Seattle, WA			
Portland, OR			Worcester, MA			
			Livonia, MI			
			Lexington, KY			
			Chicago Heights, IL			

the key commitments guaranteeing that a serious attempt would be made to form a local council based on the shared responsibility of major sectors.

The table also reveals that local government agencies (particularly CETA programs), youth service agencies, community action agencies, and organized labor played limited roles at the early stages of council development. Other sectors -- parent groups, youth groups, political parties, professional associations, civic associations -- are not shown because their roles were, and still are, quite limited.

Numerous questions -- still unanswered -- are raised by this table:

- Will collaboration of all major sectors occur and work?
- Will education and private employers dominate the directions taken by the councils?
- Will community-wide support for councils be generated?

The table also leaves unanswered other leadership-related questions:

- Do council leaders represent the sectors from which they come or are these persons acting principally in individual capacities?
- Does the presence of these persons on the council really provide the council with recognized credibility and "clout" in its dealings with other persons and organizations in the community and elsewhere?

Reliable answers to these questions will not be offered in this report. Systematic collection of data under the National Institute of Education's forthcoming descriptive study and evaluation of collaborative councils should clarify these and other issues.

Council Representation

During the first nine months of the full Consortium, volunteer members demonstrated a high degree of resilience and stability. Instances of members dropping out because of disappointment or frustration are known, but

are not common. In fact, turnover appears to be a combination of non-related personal issues and the active efforts of council leaders to replace inactive or ineffective members with more committed ones.

The overall direction of change in terms of sector representation is not clear. Some councils have defined criteria for sector balance in membership. Most do not. Many have made concerted effort to achieve wider representation, especially from organized labor.

Table V profiles the Consortium-wide distribution of local council membership (as of November 1977) in categories asked for in the quarterly progress reports from communities to NMI. The numbers are not wholly reliable. School board members could be reported by their occupational category, or professionals might be lumped into business/industry. On the basis of this table and related data, several observations can be made:

- Council governing bodies ranged in size from 11 to 31 members, with an average size of 23 members.

- Most councils had from six to eight community sectors represented through membership on the council's governing body. Approximately 85 percent of the Consortium councils fell into this group. Two councils (making up 10 percent of the Consortium) had representation from five sectors, and one council (5 percent of the Consortium) drew its membership from only two sectors.

- All councils, except Jamestown, New York, had representatives from both the education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) and business/industry sectors. All councils, except Jamestown, New York, and Mesa, Arizona, had members representing government. All councils, except Charleston, South Carolina, and Martin County, North Carolina, had labor representatives on their governing bodies.

- The community sectors most heavily represented in the Consortium were education (25.4%) and business/industry (28.6%). Government and labor representatives each made up 12.6% of the membership, with volunteer agencies accounting for an additional 9 percent. The professions and youth themselves emerge as the least represented sectors supplying only 3 percent and 1.9 percent respectively of the total Consortium membership. Approximately 6.9 percent of the total representation fell into the "other" category.

TABLE V

THE WORK-EDUCATION CONSORTIUM COMMUNITY SECTOR REPRESENTATION*

COMMUNITY SECTOR	REPRESENTATIVES**	
	Number	Percent
Elementary/Secondary Education	67 } 119	14.3 } 25.4
Postsecondary Education	52 }	11.1 }
Business/Industry	133	28.6
Government	59	12.6
Labor	59	12.6
Volunteer Agencies	42	9.0
Professions	14	3.0
Youth	9	1.9
Other	32	6.9
Total	467	100.0

** Individuals on council governing bodies

# Sectors Represented on Governing Body	2	5	6	7	8	
# Councils	1	2	6	5	6	= 20
% Councils	5%	10%	30%	25%	30%	

* Only local councils are included in these tabulations; the state-wide Industry-Education Council of California is omitted.

Activities of Consortium Councils

The activities of local councils participating in the Work-Education Consortium Project are of two basic types:

- Activities aimed at organizing the councils: gathering core resources, defining council priorities, selecting internal leadership, maintaining cohesiveness of purposes and membership interests, managing resources, and so forth.

- Activities aimed at implementing the purposes of the councils: brokering interests of other community groups, defining the youth transition problems of the community, developing and organizing plans to address those problems, and implementing those plans directly or with the assistance of non-council resources.

Activities aimed at organizing and maintaining Consortium councils as ongoing organizations have been mentioned already. Defining a need for a council, recruiting members, selecting priorities and anticipated outcomes, selecting a staff director judged competent to do the in-depth work needed to make those outcomes feasible, gaining institutional credibility, converting that credibility into human and material resources essential to further growth and reformulation of directions -- all these "process activities" are integral to any comprehensive understanding of the Consortium Project and individual council progress. The time and personnel needed to collect systematic data about these processes have not been available to the Consortium Project.

What remains as fact is that councils have pursued the steps of formal organization with substantial success, as was reported in Table III. Many have prepared bylaws and job descriptions for their staff positions. About one-third have acted as their own fiscal agents. And about one-third have received CETA Title II or Title VI "slots" by seeking and winning recognition as qualified community-based organizations.

In addition to these formal steps, many councils have received public recognition, and broader community acceptance of their existence through annual dinners, press releases, and other public relations activities. Others have sought or are seeking general support for their activities from community, government, and foundation sources.

The interrelationships between these "process" activities and the "product" activities for which the councils were organized are complex. Councils have taken two basic approaches to the organizational problem of defining their mission and priorities, and the substantive problem of addressing youth transition issues.

One strategy has been to pursue needs assessments of various types as mechanisms for involving council members and informing them of the problems at hand. This information development strategy generally is designed to establish the council's identity as a fact-finding, coordinating, non-threatening, constructive organization at the same time as council members are sorting out and informing their own thinking and priorities.

Another strategy has been to take on projects that demonstrate to council members, and to other community leaders, the council's value as a catalyst for needed action or as an effective broker to tackle commonly recognized problems. The intent of this strategy is to build momentum and widespread recognition for the council with the expectation that heightened interest from the community will eventually be focused on more comprehensive planning and problem solving.

Obviously, the two strategies can be complementary and -- in a relatively short period of time -- can be forged into a cyclical strategy of information collection, analysis, and action. Or, depending on personalities

and the interests of other community organizations, the component parts of these strategies can be performed in part or in whole by a council. The actual practices of councils have ranged from one end of this continuum to the other: from councils that have pursued specific project opportunities on a primarily ad hoc basis to those that have pursued a community-wide process of problem identification, anlaysis, prioritization, and consensus in anticipation of creating community-wide understanding and action.

Every successful "product" enhances member self-esteem and external recognition. Every failure to recruit the right community person, or every wasted day of trying to find the proper mix of council priorities diminishes the good will essential for even the best designed project to succeed. Describing the complex "process" activities is essential to understanding the successes and failures of the Consortium Project, but this data is also the most difficult to collect and interpret. It is hoped that the up-coming NIE description and evaluation fo community work-education councils will have the resources appropriate to this sensitive task. Activities aimed at implementing the purposes of the councils are more readily described because the data is more readily available. These are the ends for which organizational process activities are the means.

In their short period of existence the local councils appear to have been effective and productive. Attachment A, The Work-Education Consortium: An Inventory of Projects in Progress was prepared in February and March 1978, when the median age of the councils was about one year. This document tends to understate council achievements because it does not take into account the substantial investments of volunteer and staff time required to establish and maintain each council's momentum during this first year. Recruiting members,

preparing bylaws, establishing financial accountability, filing papers for incorporation and tax-exempt status, and initiating the group meetings needed to make these steps reality all could qualify as activities, as has been noted above.

On the other hand, Attachment A may, in another sense, overestimate the progress of some councils because it does not compare actual activities to either what each council had hoped to achieve or had tried to achieve by this time.

In balance, the nine categories of activities contained in Attachment A are meant to serve two basic purposes:

- To demonstrate that Consortium councils have not flinched from addressing tough, persistent problems, and that the councils frequently have made major contributions to developing solutions.
- To demonstrate that locally selected priorities in youth transition program development are far more diverse and imaginative than could possibly be mandated through federal programs.

As examples of the variety of activities, we can draw on some of the descriptive titles in that publication:

- Survey of Business for a Community Resource Directory
- Community Volunteer Network
- Clearinghouse for Employer Resources
- Catalog of Career Education Programs -- Public, Parochial and Independent
- Employability Workshops for Students
- Vocational Exploration and Job Exposure Program
- "Project Business" for Eighth and Ninth Graders
- Field Experience Education Program
- Computerized Career Information Program

- Examination of the Responsiveness of Employment Service Agencies to "Difficult to Place" Youth
- Accessing a State-wide Occupational Information System at the Local Level
- Occupational Awareness Courses for Teachers
- Summer Work-Experience for High School Counselors
- Development of a Labor-Management Curriculum
- Public Workshop on YEDPA
- Development of Linkages Among Community Groups Impacting Youth
- Council Representation on YEDPA Youth Council
- Forum on Apprenticeship Issues
- Identification of Existing Youth Transition Services and Unmet Service Needs
- State-wide Conference on the Work-Education Collaborative Process
- Regional Conference on the School-to-Work Transition
- Development of a Youth Employment Charter
- Conference on New Job Opportunities for Youth in Energy-Related Fields
- Committee on the Employment of Handicapped Individuals
- Assessment of GED Tutoring and Testing in Philadelphia

A review of these activities of local councils shows clearly the significant overlapping of interests among councils. Many councils, for example, found that their need to inform themselves about youth services and about employer perceptions of youth and of education reflected a community-wide lack of this kind of information. Consequently, surveys of various kinds have been widely used, each with a somewhat different purpose and intended audience but each aimed at the same broad issue of community needs assessment.

With few exceptions, these surveys have been competent efforts, produced under staff or council committee direction, occasionally with assistance from skilled consultants. Rates of return on these surveys have been high, in large part because council staff and local volunteers were used to make direct personal contact with employers, youth service agencies, and other community groups. The needs assessment of community resources and career education in Oakland, California, a product of that city's Community Careers Council, is one innovative illustration of this point. It is included with this report as Attachment F.

Other areas of frequent council involvement included designing or working with projects providing career information and education services or projects directly supportive of elementary, secondary, and college level career education programs; developing career exploration and structured work experience opportunities for teachers and guidance counselors; working with local CETA prime sponsors to build community-wide awareness (especially private sector) or program opportunities under CETA and YEDPA and assisting in the development of comprehensive manpower delivery systems; and working to develop greater community awareness of youth transition issues and their impact on economic development, school curriculum, and quality of working life.

Many councils showed a great interest in career education. This interest reflected the substantial involvement in the councils of leaders from local secondary and postsecondary educational institutions already active in career education programs.

During the summer of 1977, the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Career Education issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for "Strengthening Edu-

cation's Participation in the Work-Education Consortium Project." The competition was restricted to local education agencies (LEAs) working collaboratively with WECP councils. Four LEAs working with Consortium councils in Livonia, Michigan; Mesa, Arizona; Portland, Oregon; and Worcester, Massachusetts were selected for one-year grants of $25,000 each. The State of California's Department of Public Instruction won one of six similar state-level awards, making a total of five Consortium councils involved in this special incentive project for education-work collaboration. Six other Consortium councils submitted unsuccessful proposals.

Later in the year, the Office of Career Education included eight Consortium communities (the four above plus Alma, Michigan; Chicago Heights, Illinois; New York, New York; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) among the 15 communities invited to participate in a year long series of "mini-conferences" designed to focus national attention on exemplary practitioners of collaboration in career education.

Council Activities: Consortium and Non-Consortium Contacts

Council activities -- whether organizational or substantive -- have inevitably brought council directors and members into direct contact with a wide audience. To some degree this wider audience has been created through the readership of the Work-Education Exchange and through other project activities. But by far the largest and most meaningful portion of these direct contacts has resulted from each council's own initiatives, locally, regionally, and within their states.

NMI has attempted to document these contacts through the quarterly progress reports submitted to NMI by council executive directors. In practice,

the volume of local contacts has overloaded the record keeping system and even contacts outside the council areas have not been thoroughly recorded. However, it is possible to report in a general way on the type and frequency of these contacts.

By the end of the second quarter of the contract year (October 1977), all communities had had some contact with other Consortium communities, and all but one reported some contact with non-Consortium organizations and communities.

The nature of these contacts ranged from serious to superficial. For most council exeuctive directors and chairpersons, the only site visit made during the second project year was in connection with the October 1977 conference in Portland. While all Consortium meetings provide a valuable opportunity for exchange of experience among project participants, the Portland meeting was the only WECP meeting specifically designed as an intensive review of one community's experience in collaborative efforts to deal with youth transition problems from a comprehensive perspective.

Other types of interaction within the Consortium have included exchanges of information:

- Newsletters, brochures, and other publications. During the first Consortium year, two local councils published regular newsletters (for examples, see Attachment G), bylaws, and incorporation papers.
- Needs assessment survey techniques, questionnaires and results.
- Information descriptive of projects operated or coordinated by councils or other community organizations.
- Information about federally funded projects operating in Consortium communities.
- Names and background information regarding external sources of technical assistance.

- Strategies for developing local funding.
- Technical assistance in developing specific council activities.

During the first year of the Consortium, site visits among individual councils were infrequent. During the third quarter, for example, only four councils were involved in such visits. Interest in exchange visits remains high, but has been frustrated in part by the daily commitments of council directors and chairpersons to their local responsibilities. In part, the felt need for knowledge about other Consortium councils has been met through regular Consortium meetings and WECP publications.

Most contacts reported by council directors have been closer to home and more directly related to specific council interests. At the local level, these contacts are often beyond the record keeping capacity of council directors, for their roles require intensive travel and telephoning within the area served by their councils. Local travel and telephone are two budget categories for which councils directors almost uniformly report unanticipated expenses.

Reports of non-Consortium contacts are particularly variable. Unusually inclusive reports of these contacts for two councils (Bethel, Maine and Wheeling, West Virginia) during one reporting quarter (November 1977 - January 1978) are included as Figures 1 and 2. The reports illustrate the wide variety of topics, external organizations, and individuals that shape the role, responsibilities, and schedule of an effective council director.

NMI anticipates that both the quality and the quantity of Consortium contacts will continue to grow during the third year (the second Consortium year). Two council directors commented in the most recent quarterly report:

Contacts with Non-Consortium communities, councils, organizations, individuals	Initiated by your Council	Contacts Received	Topic of Contact (Assistance Requested)	Type of Assistance Received or Provided
(Please list contacts during the report quarter e.g., Federal-level, state level, community-level,individuals)				
19. Maine Bureau of Labor	1		Request for materials	Materials received
16. Dept. of Ed. and Cultural Services	3	1	Request for clarification of liability issues in alternate school program	Pending
17. Maine Council on Economic Education	2	1	Request for materials	Materials received
18. State A-95 Clearinghouse	1	1	Request for A-95 materials	Materials received
19. Ms. Dottie Anderson		1	Graduate study of community education - request for description of EWC.	Materials sent
20. Coordinator-Title 1-A	1	2	Request for description of EWC.	Material sent
21. Maine Dept. of Manpower Affairs	3		Request for labor force and income data	Material received
22. CERG	2	2	Request for consultant work and labor sharing	Refused
23. St. Dic. of Comm. Services	1	1	Info. on Fed. Program review (A-95 clearinghouse) material on YCC prog. and applications	Information received
24. Nells Wilson	2		Info. re: graduate interns in community development (U-Maine)	Information received
25. Oxford County Community Services (OCCS)	3	2	Local implementation of YEDPA	Coordination of efforts
26. AVRPC	2	1	Student Intern Project	Coordination of efforts
27. DOL (Regional) Bureau of App. and Training	2		Request for materials	Materials received
28. N. Oxford Voc. Area (NOVA)		1	Request for Council rep. on Advisory Co.	Executive Director accepted
29. Young Life		2	Request for mailing on Bethel Project	Response mailed
30. Local attorney	1		Incorporation certificate review	Referred to another atty.
31. Supt. of schools	1	2	Career Education discussions	Cooperation of District

50

Chart 3: Description of Contacts (except for site visits)Between Non-Consortium Organizations and Individuals and Bethel Area During Report Quarter

Sample Report of Council Contacts

34
Figure 1

51

Non-Consortium Site Visits	# Visits BY Your Council	# Visits TO Your Council	Length of Visit (in days)	PURPOSE OF VISIT (Assistance Requested	TYPE OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED OR PROVIDED
(Please list non-Consortium visits made or hosted by Council					
1) Governor's Office of Employment & Training, Charleston, W.Va.	3	2	full day	CETA & YEDPA matters involving local agencies and LEA	Full cooperation and 2 CETA slots
2) W. Va. Labor Federation-AFL-CIO President's Office Charleston, W.Va	1	0	full day	Apprenticeship programs and labor support of training program	Full cooperation
3) W. Va Dept. of Employment Security, Commissioner's Office, Charleston, W. Va.	2	1	full day	Manpower Needs Survey	Technical assistance and in-kind assistance
4) W. Va. University Graduate School of Social Work Morgantown, W. Va.	2	1	full day	Recruitment and Interviewing Intern for Manpower Needs Survey	Intern hired
5) Wetzel County School District, Superintendent New Martinsville, V. Va.	1	0	2 hours	Response to request for information regarding possibilities of expanding Education-Work Council Activities	Information provided
6) Marshall County School District, Superintendent Moundsville, W. Va.	1	0	1½ hours	Response to request for information regarding possibilities of expanding Council activities	Information provided
7) W. Va. University Graduate School of Counseling & Guidance, Morgantown, W. Va.	4	2	2-3 hours	Occupational Awareness Workshop matters and future projects	Excellent cooperation
8) W. Va. Apprenticeship Council's Office Charleston, W. Va.	1	0	1 day	Apprenticeship Training-Related training programs	Full cooperation and assistance assured
9) W. Va. Dept. of Employment Security-Research & Statistics Division Charleston, W. Va.	1	0	1 day	Manpower Needs Survey Technical Assistance	Technical assistance

Sample Report of Council Site Visits

35

Figure 2

Chart 4: Description of Site Visits Between Non-Consortium Organizations and Communities and Education-Work Council of the Upper Ohio Valley During Report Quarter (fill in your Council's name).

- As this project progresses, my interactive contacts with other Consortium members is increasing both in frequency and in value. I believe that several of the Project Directors are suggesting to NMI further ways of increasing communication among the Project Directors, and among these would be periodic meetings for the Directors with NMI staff either nationally or regionally and some regularized conference calls by phone which would permit Directors to interact with each other on key and current issues.

- We are beginning to expand the use of both local non-Consortium contacts and Consortium contacts, as our needs become more clearly defined. The local contacts are currently more important, but the national contacts have provided the basis for materials with which to build assessments of local programs.

Budget Issues

Each council participating in the Consortium Project received financial support directly from the Office of National Programs in the Department of Labor on a contractual basis. For accounting and auditing purposes, unincorporated councils received their funds through a designated local fiscal agent, usually an organization already involved in sponsoring the council.

A fixed price contracting procedure with monthly reimbursement payment schedules was used for all councils. The contract called for quarterly financial reports to the National Manpower Institute, but actual funding was based on the payment schedule established in the contracts and on submission by the fiscal agent of a monthly voucher requesting payment in the agreed amount. These vouchers were sent by each council to the project director at the National Manpower Institute. NMI in turn recorded the receipt of the vouchers and turned them over to the WECP project officer in the Department of Labor. Total turn around time from council submission to check receipt was normally two weeks.

Consortium councils reported generally excellent relationships with both the Department of Labor and their fiscal agents, where councils were not their

own agents. Only two types of problems were noted:

- Five councils experienced cash flow restrictions because of delays in the receipt of their payments. In all but two instances this inconvenience was reported for a single month only.
- In two cases, small amounts of local funds were sought and received to assist councils with cash flow problems arising from delays in initial payments, and in occasional cases of exceeding monthly totals in the programmed schedule of payments.

By the end of the third quarter (January 1978) at least 14 Consortium councils were receiving program funding from sources in addition to the Department of Labor. Six of these councils had received funding -- not always from the same sources -- prior to Consortium membership. The additional sources of funding included:

- U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
- Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce
- State departments of education
- A local private foundation
- Corporations
- Local school system and/or college contributions on budget line items
- Membership fees (applies to one local council)
- City governments (HUD Block Planning Grant in one case, local government budget in another case)
- Local Prime Sponsors (in at least six instances, under Titles II and VI, and under YEDPA)
- Tuition from career guidance courses taught

Total income received by any one council from any combination of sources (in no case more than four sources) ranged from $2,500 to about $55,000

during the first nine months of Consortium activity. The median amount received would be about $10,000 if the salary value of CETA Titles II and VI personnel is included.

Several other funding efforts by local councils for foundation grants and federal or state projects were unsuccessful. On the whole, council directors were not absorbed in fund raising efforts during the first year of the Consortium Project. Where funding sources were pursued, this generally was the result of carefully considered probabilities.

Councils also were supported quite effectively through in-kind services received from various community sources. The thousands of hours of volunteer time contributed by council members themselves is the most obvious contribution, but one which only a few of the councils have sought to quantify and price. Three councils reported no in-kind support at all during the first nine months.

Types of in-kind services reported include:

- Materials (e.g., office supplies and furniture)
- Administrative services (e.g., key-punching, clerical support, postage)
- Utilities and office space
- Professional consultation services (e.g., audits, management planning, legal services, graphic artist)
- Computer services
- Travel and entertainment expenses

Council reports show much inconsistency in estimates of the value of in-kind support. Estimates ranged from $90 to $106,000 for administrative services alone during the first quarter (with an average of about $2,700 if the highest value is omitted). Comparing estimates from the first and third quarters,

councils appear to have received an average of about $3,500 worth of services of all types each quarter.

Technical Assistance Requests

Technical assistance provided to Consortium councils by NMI program officers throughout the period of the contract has been described in part earlier in this section of the report and is covered more comprehensively in the following section on the Information Exchange Service.

Council directors were asked in the quarterly reports to itemize specific requests for technical assistance. These requests tended to be continuing, reflecting the basic ongoing concerns for funding, maintaining councils as effective organizations, and keeping councils informed about national legislation and programs dealing directly or indirectly with youth transition.

C. Observations on Consortium Progress

Explanation of the community councils concept was the first of a series of action recommendations made in The Boundless Resource. A testing period of two to five years and an estimated budget of from $100,000 to $250,000 (with combination funding from the federal government, private foundations, and private and public local sources) for each council was suggested.

In practice, the Consortium idea is being given an initial two-year test supported principally by the federal contracts with NMI and with each of the local councils. Federal support has averaged just over $40,000 per council during the first year, with other financial and in-kind support estimated at an average of $15,000 per council during the first year. In effect,

the councils are under intense pressure to perform and to find continuing funding at the same time that they are coming to terms with the complexity and ambitiousness of their mission.

The intensive learning experience of the past two years has served to confirm several NMI suppositions:

- Independent status has been an invaluable asset to most councils, enabling them to broker relationships between major community sectors, and to initiate activities other institutions are unable to initiate on their own. Even those councils initially affiliated with a school system or a community college have gravitated to positions of independence. Most encouraging is that parent organizations in Consortium communities have recognized their own self-interests being served by council independence.

- The variations among interests and local conditions has reconfirmed the early emphasis on looking at councils as implementors of a collaborative process rather than as being tied to specific technical approaches or to specific substantive programs. In some instances discussions about "process" have been allowed to distract members from their original interests in joining the councils. Overall, however, councils are rapidly maturing in their abilities to work through their own definitions of problems, priorities, and solutions.

- Essential to the progress of each council has been the ability of the full-time director to solicit ideas, identify and develop community skills and resources, conceptualize strategies, and assure that council members and others in the community with related interests become involved in the development of those strategies. Conversely, perhaps the most important decisions

made by new councils have been determining the leadership role of the council director and selecting an individual who can meet that expected style. As individual councils have gained experience and confidence, this leadership role of the director has been enhanced by the increasing involvement of community leaders on the council.

- Similarly, the ability of councils to work out their own understanding and practice of community collaboration has resulted in differing approaches to council organization and membership, differing expectations of council missions within a community, differing levels of involvement of non-members in council activities, and differing senses of strategic or tactical timing in dealing with community institutions. Organizational flexibility has created many variations on a common theme and thereby helped to define the real world meaning and potential of local collaboration.

- Institutional change is occurring in Consortium communities not simply because local councils exist, but because the personal and institutional interests of those communities desire change. Councils have acted as forums for ideas and proposals. Councils and their staffs have acted as catalysts and brokers, demonstrating the feasibility of ideas and the commonality of interests. Councils have in many instances taken direct responsibility for seeing projects through to completion. In a few cases, access to federal and state resources has enabled councils to pursue their objectives despite the inertia of established institutions, or despite a council's own failure to mobilize other institutional resources. Where the collaborative process is working well, councils are earning the respect of their communities by helping institutions recognize the feasibility of joint action and then helping, as needed, to make sure those actions occur.

- It is clear that membership in a national consortium has stimulated the interest and seriousness of council members and others in their communities as they focus on youth transition problems. The sense of "connectedness" to national thinking, legislation, visibility, and funding opportunities has made these local initiatives more effective than they might have been.

- In about half the Consortium communities, it is doubtful if independent councils would now exist but for the stimulus of the project. The "seed money" strategy shows strong prospects of succeeding in many communities. The two-year lead time, however, may be more appropriate for more sophisticated, generally active communities than it is for less cohesive, less energetic communities. The necessity now to develop local funding strategies is clearly putting pressure on councils to define and achieve levels of performance judged to be meaningful by local leaders.

- The involvement of an intermediary organization appears to have been effective and highly satisfactory to all parties. Some councils have made more use of this source of assistance than have others. In some instances, NMI has been a source of external validation of council initiatives. In other cases, NMI has been actively involved in developing local strategies, assisting with funding efforts, or helping to initiate councils. For all communities, NMI's role as convenor of workshops and conferences has at least helped to fill the need for a sense of comparative progress. At this stage in the early life of a new idea, the need for this networking of pioneer interests appears well established.

- Although the project and the councils have been funded through the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), the actual involvement

of Consortium councils in prime sponsor programs has been variable. Some councils have sought and received CETA "slots" under Titles II and VI. A few councils have been recipients of YEDPA funds, or been actively involved in decisions to allocate those funds. Overall, councils and prime sponsors have approached each other cautiously, with some of the differences in memberships and missions becoming understood only gradually. Both sides could benefit from further conversations and clarification. This is one area where explanatory support for the councils by federal and regional DOL offices could be especially meaningful in creating a positive atmosphere for those discussions.

IV. Information Exchange Service and Other Technical Assistance

A. Information Exchange Service

The Information Exchange Service (IES) was designed to help stimulate the development of local work-education councils by maintaining a clearinghouse of information and technical assistance resources on work-education initiatives. The plan for the IES was based on the belief that many youth transition models and program practices exist or are being developed, and that practitioners can help each other to develop councils and quality programs if they can be put in touch with each other and can be kept informed of recent developments and new materials. NMI assumed that some materials would be available through sources known to the Exchange Service, some through direct contributions from Consortium communities, and that some new "products" would be prepared on specific areas of interest concerned with the concept and development of councils. The emphasis would be on a user-based service with continued reassessment of the quality and relevance of the services offered.

It was anticipated that the Exchange Service would serve the Consortium communities in an intensive way, providing them with information packets several times a month, with analyses of policy and legislative issues, and with specific information on request. The Consortium staff would also organize conferences and workshops for participant communities, with the Information Exchange assuming administrative responsibility.

To serve the many people who contacted NMI during the site selection process and those who learned of the Consortium as it developed, the IES would provide a free newsletter and respond to individual requests for

information from the clearinghouse to the greatest extent possible. In order to better serve the Consortium communities and to build the capability to provide information through the clearinghouse, the IES developed a plan for categorizing and retrieving the information collected.

The IES, therefore, was organized with two goals in mind: (1) to serve the Consortium communities by facilitating the exchange of information and technical assistance among them and between the communities and other assistance sources such as national organizations and federal agencies; (2) to serve anyone interested in education-work initiatives in a much less intensive way through a free newsletter and through the clearinghouse.

The goal of serving the Consortium communities included the following specific objectives:

- Bringing community representatives together periodically to render technical assistance and to provide the opportunity for the communities to exchange ideas and technical assistance;
- Informing the communities of policies, legislation, funding sources, and other activities in the area of youth development;
- Aiding in the development of products generated as a result of working with the Consortium communities, such as descriptive documents and papers on issue areas of concern to the communities; and,
- Responding to the needs of the communities for specific information.

The newsletter, The Work-Education Exchange, designed to serve the broad audience, also served the Consortium councils by giving them heightened visibility in their communities and elsewhere. The newsletter was intended to accomplish the following objectives:

- To stimulate interest in the concept and development of local work-education councils;

- To provide visibility to existing models so that other interested communities can better understand how the process of collaboration can be developed and what happens as that process evolves in a community;

- To make known the products (such as specialized papers and manuals) generated as a result of working with the Consortium communities;

- To keep interested parties informed about the activities and findings of the Work-Education Consortium Project; and

- To provide specific information in a variety of areas relevant to education-work initiatives and youth development projects.

The accomplishments of the Exchange Service over the last two years can be organized by major activity areas:

- Conferences and Workshops
- Information Mailouts
- Publications
- Newsletter
- Clearinghouse
- Outreach and Dissemination

Conferences and Workshops

The Information Exchange Service has provided the administrative and agenda support for six conferences and workshops during the second year of the contract:

- Work-Education Consortium Conference — April 4-6, 1977
  Columbia, Maryland
  (Agenda appended as Attachment H)

- Work-Education Consortium Regional Workshop — July 18-20, 1977
  Elkridge, Maryland

- Work-Education Consortium Regional Workshop — July 27-29, 1977
  Salt Lake City, Utah

- Workshop on Collaborative Process Building for Local Implementation of YEDPA — September 15-16, 1977
  Washington, DC
  (Conference Report appended as Attachment C)

- Youth Development and Employment: Involving the Community
  Portland, Oregon (The Winter 1977-78 issue of The Work-Education Exchange (Attachment I) includes a report of this workshop.)
  October 17-19, 1977

- Work-Education Councils and Rural Conditions
  Alma, Michigan (Conference agenda packet appended as Attachment J.)
  Nov. 30 - Dec. 2, 1977

- Work-Education Consortium Conference
  Kiawah Island, South Carolina (Conference report currently in draft.)
  February 13-16, 1978

- Work-Education Consortium Directors' Conference
  Washington, D.C.
  February 13-16, 1978

The Exchange Service handled all logistics and administrative details for the meetings, provided participants with background materials, and assisted in the preparation of workshop reports.

The first full Consortium Conference in April 1977, was the first time most of the Consortium community participants met each other, the staffs of the several sponsoring organizations, and the representatives of federal agencies. The meeting served primarily as an orientation session. The two regional workshops in July provided an opportunity for the participants to discuss, in small groups, their progress and problems during the first few months of Consortium membership. They were also briefed on the youth legislation that was then making its way through Congress. The September and October workshops differed from the earlier conferences in that they were working sessions to provide information on specific areas of interest to councils. Both the October meeting in Portland, Oregon, and the February, 1978 meeting near Charleston, South Carolina, were unique in that they included visits to projects and plants in Consortium communities. Of the seven meetings

to date, three have been held in Consortium communities; the host communities appreciated these opportunities to include their council members in the meetings, and to increase their visibility. Other participants reported benefits from these chances to visit Consortium communities, see some of the local programs, and meet the council members. It is, of course, a great help to the Exchange Service staff to be able to work with a locally-based council staff in planning meetings.

Information Mailouts

The Information Exchange Service has provided Consortium communities with regular information mailouts. Selected examples of the types of items distributed include:

- "Agenda for Action," a report of the Secretary of Commerce's Conference on Youth Career Development
- "Work: The Prospects for Tomorrow," by Russell B. Flanders, in Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Spring Issue 1977
- Profiles of Career Education Projects (FY 1976)
- Education, Service and Work: The Multi-Funded Approach, prepared by the Federal Interagency Committee on Education
- CETA and Youth: Programs for Cities, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors
- Toward a Federal Policy on Education and Work, by Barry Stern
- Funding information and application materials for Career Education, Community Education, FIPSE, Vocational Education, etc.
- Summaries of Youth Employment legislation, Federal Register notices, and final bill, charter, knowledge development plan, and regulations

The Exchange Service staff has found national organizations, government agencies, and other groups and individuals to be very helpful in suggesting materials of interest to the Consortium and often in providing complimentary

copies and reprints of materials. A complete list of information mail-outs to Consortium communities, listed by project quarter, is included as Attachment K.

Publications

The Information Exchange Service has coordinated the preparation, publication, and dissemination of nine project-related papers:

- The Work Education Consortium: An Inventory of Projects in Progress (Attachment A)
- Work-Education Councils: Profiles of 21 Collaborative Efforts (Attachment B)
- Community Councils and the Transitions Between Education and Work, by Paul Barton (Attachment L)
- Collaborative Process Building for Local Implementation of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977: A Work-Education Consortium Workshop Report (Attachment C)
- On Developing Community Work-Education Councils, by Karl Gudenberg (Attachment M)
- Work and Service Experience for Youth (Attachment D)
- Designing Youth Policy: Starting Points, by Paul Barton (Attachment N)
- Evaluating the Work-Education Consortium Project: An Overview of Issues and Options, by Steven Jung (Attachment O)
- Job Placement Services for Youth (Attachment Q)

NMI provides these publications to Consortium communities in limited quantities without cost and has received numerous requests for them from readers of The Work-Education Exchange and others.

The Consortium Newsletter -- The Work-Education Exchange

Five issues of the Work-Education Consortium newsletter, The Work-Education Exchange, have been published (January-February, March-April, May-

July, and August-September 1977, and Winter 1977-78), and the sixth is in press. The five issues are included with this report as Attachment P. The newsletter has included the following categories of information:

- Articles on education-work policy matters.
- Annotated summaries and ordering information for relevant publications.
- Descriptions of local education-work councils and their activities.
- Announcements of workshops, conferences, and training opportunities.
- Information on national organizations and clearinghouses that provide useful services.
- Potential funding sources.
- Updates on relevant federal and state legislation and programs.
- News about the NMI, AACJC, NAB, and New Jersey Consortium projects.

The newsletter mailing list began with all of the people who had contacted NMI about the project since the beginning of the contract -- almost 2,000 names. During the year the newsletter has been published, the list has more than doubled. In addition, the IES mails The Work-Education Exchange to AACJC's institutional mailing list of 1,500 for a total of more than 5,000. The list has been computerized to facilitate special mailings to target audiences and to allow for an ongoing analysis of the constituency of the Work-Education Consortium.

Central Collection of Information on Education-Work Initiatives

The Information Exchange Service has supervised the ongoing collection, organization, and processing of information and technical assistance resources

on work-education initiatives. The Service maintains detailed files on each of the Consortium communities, including the AACJC, NAB, and New Jersey projects; descriptive and technical assistance materials received from communities across the county; materials on federal government agencies, and on national and regional organizations concerned with youth development and employment. Much of this material is currently being summarized on resource "fact sheets" and categorized according to subject areas. This collection of materials is invaluable in providing technical assistance to the communities.

The IES was designed with the expectation of receiving requests for information on exemplary programs, for technical assistance, and for referrals, not only from Consortium participants, but from the readers of the newsletter and from others who learned of the clearinghouse. The vast majority of inquiries to the IES concern questions about the Consortium Project itself and orders for project publications.

Outreach and Dissemination

Throughout the two-year project, the Information Exchange Service has provided project information to the media and to other interested national organizations. As interest in youth transition issues has increased over the past two years, requests for information about the collaborative council concept and about the Work-Education Consortium Project have grown, and NMI officers and staff have received increasing numbers of requests to represent the project in various national, regional, state and local conferences and meetings. The IES has also been providing materials describing the Consortium to such conferences.

B. Technical Assistance and Liaison with the Consortium

Direct technical assistance to Consortium councils by NMI management and staff continued throughout the second year. This assistance has ranged from site visits by NMI management and staff, to the gathering of specialized materials and brokering of information from Washington-based organizations, to frequent telephone conversations concerning analysis of local council projects and plans.

Technical assistance site visits serve varied purposes, depending upon the needs of the local council. Foremost among these purposes are to give assistance in building effective relationships with critical actors in the community, to help councils develop organizational strategies and action agendas, and to provide outside perspective on council progress. Typical site visits are several days long and may include the participation of NMI staff as speakers or commentators at meetings of local councils or of other community organizations. Project staff have visited each of the communities an average of three times since the selection site visits were completed. Senior Institute management have worked on-site with nearly all Consortium communities at least once over the past 26 months. Community representatives have come to Washington for technical assistance meetings with NMI staff and to meet with others, often through the brokering efforts of the Institute.

These brokering efforts have resulted in meetings, the exchange of technical assistance, and the development of new relationships among Consortium members and between Consortium members and others. Many new contacts have been made in the course of collecting information and identifying resource people for the six WECP conferences and workshops. These contacts were made

with federal and state government agencies, national youth service agencies, and local organizations.

The National Manpower Institute has introduced other agencies and organizations to Consortium communities when they shared common interests. Examples of this kind of brokering include:

- Assisting representatives from the Ford Foun ation in identifying and visiting communities conducting innovative youth programs. (Oakland, Portland, Seattle, and the Industry Education Council of California)

- Assisting representatives from the Institute for Educational Leadership in identifying and visiting innovative education/work programs. (Portland)

- Assisting a representative of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor in visiting several Consortium communities in the western states to explore possible linkages between Consortium communities and Women's Bureau projects and planned consultations on teenage women's career awareness.

Institute management have met with representatives of state and regional organizations to apprise them of the Consortium's activities and of possibilities for linkages:

- Met with Chief State School Officers of most of the states in which there are Consortium communities to discuss ways in which states might most effectively be involved in the Work-Education Consortium initiative.

- Met additionally with the Superintendent of Education of Illinois to discuss possible state linkages with local councils.

NMI has fa ilitated contacts between Consortium communities and national organizations and federal agencies:

- Identified four community representatives to attend an Education Policy Seminar on Career Education sponsored by the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, D C.

- Frequently introduce Consortium members to representatives of federal agencies that can provide information and assistance.

Among Consortium members, NMI has brokered technical assistance visits, thus maximizing the expertise that exists within the Consortium. Perhaps the best example of intra-Consortium brokering was NMI's cosponsoring, with the Mid-Michigan Community Action Council, of the conference on "Work-Education Councils and Rural Conditions." This conference was a response to an expressed need of the rural councils to meet with each other and with resource people from outside the Consortium to address issues that are unique to the rural situation.

IV. Directions for the Next Project Year

The National Manpower Institute has anticipated in its planning a number of changes in the focus of the Consortium Project in the coming year. The technical assistance needs of the communities have changed with their increased sophistication. At the same time, the Consortium is ready now to direct more of its time and energies to addressing the information and technical assistance interests of communities beyond the Consortium. Described below are the major planned categories of activity for the coming year, focusing mainly on changes in NMI's role and responsibilities within the Consortium.

A. Technical Assistance Services to Work-Education Consortium Communities

The emphasis of Institute technical assistance activities will shift to reflect the greater maturity of the local work-education councils. The principal categories of technical assistance services to be provided in the third year will include (1) Consortium community servicing, including both on-site and off-site consultations; (2) facilitation of community networking; (3) workshops and conferences and product development. Each of these categories is described briefly in the context of changes to accommodate the new mix of service needs.

- Community Servicing. On-site consultations will continue to be necessary, but to a reduced degree, in order to provide direction and guidance to those councils still in a formative stage and to assist more mature councils in dealing more effectively with a broadened school-to-work agenda. However, the Institute anticipates that as councils continue to develop their

programmatic and policy agendas, and as council staff capacity continues to mature, the need for directive technical assistance will not be as great as during the past year. On-site visits, consequently, will be increasingly directed toward (1) identifying the most promising local initiatives and innovations for development of materials prepared by the communities to be disseminated by the Information Exchange Service, (2) encouraging a rigorous process of self-evaluation within the councils, and (3) facilitating the gathering of important lessons and guidelines for use by other interested communities both within and outside the Consortium as well as for use at the state and federal levels. Technical assistance will also focus on the development of funding strategies for communities to enable them to continue their efforts beyond this coming year of federal support.

- Inter-Community Networking. The Institute will expand its efforts to work with the Consortium as a network to facilitate mutual interchange and linkage building between Consortium members. The networking activities of the Information Exchange Service will expand significantly to include the dissemination of technical assistance papers, case studies, fact sheets and project briefs designed to meet the needs of the councils and to disseminate promising education-work programs/practices to the entire network of Consortium communities.

- Workshops and Conferences and Product Development. A major focus of NMI efforts in the coming year will be the development of a response-oriented technical assistance capacity, and the development of an enhanced technical assistance delivery capability on the part of Consortium communities. The Consortium communities are becoming increasingly sophisticated in their assistance needs and have requested that NMI conduct workshops and

meetings to address specific issues of concern. A major function of conference and workshop activity will be to address these expressed needs. Among the issues of concern to be covered at the meetings are long term council financing, determination of council goals and objectives, managing the collaborative process, and strategies for engaging important sectors of the community in the work of councils. Involvement of council staff or council members in workshop planning and as resource persons will be increased.

A second major function of workshops and conferences will be to facilitate the identification of promising practices, and illustrative cases of collaborative action, which will expand the information base within the Consortium for rendering technical assistance to non-Consortium organizations or agencies.

A third function of workshops and conferences is to provide interested non-Consortium participants general orientation to the principles and concepts underlying the WECP initiative, collaborative action at the community level, and community work-education councils.

One full Consortium meeting, one meeting for Consortium council directors, and four area meetings are planned.

In product development, too, NMI will make an important priority the development and distribution of technical assistance materials that meet the expressed needs of Consortium members, which includes development of a technical assistance delivery capability to assist non-Consortium communities. Consortium members have indicated an interest in technical assistance products on the general issue area of how to bring about collaborative undertakings, and on such issue areas as the present and potential roles and

functions of community level intermediary organizations (councils); strategies to involve volunteers; enhancing business and labor union involvement in collaborative initiatives; financing strategies for intermediary organizations such as councils; and the techniques and applications of community resource inventorying and brokering.

NMI will develop in-house products that distill exemplary Consortium practices. Further, it will encourage Consortium participants to develop their own projects for dissemination. Each NMI Consortium council will be asked to submit, in addition to four quarterly progress reports, one technical assistance project dealing with an issue of concern to it, and the council's means of addressing the issue.

B. Services to Other Interested Communities and Agencies

During the next year of the project, NMI will develop an increased capacity to respond to communities and agencies beyond the Consortium that have expressed interest in initiating collaborative efforts to improve youth transition. NMI efforts in this regard will build upon intra-Consortium activities. The products developed within the Consortium and by NMI will be disseminated by the Information Exchange Service to a broader audience, and Consortium communities will be encouraged to implement their own outreach activities to spread adoption of the collaborative approach. Interested extra-Consortium communities and agencies will be encouraged to participate in a series of four area technical assistance meetings and workshops.

- Information Collection and Dissemination Activities. The information collection, storage, and retrieval capacity of the Information Exchange

Service will be expanded to meet the increasingly diverse information needs of non-Consortium communities and agencies, many of which have contacted NMI during the past two years. Through the Institute's Information Exchange Service, information on current legislative developments; grant and contract competitions; conferences and workshops; promising programs and practices; new publications; and important speeches relevant to youth education, training, employment, and transition issues will continue to be collected and disseminated. The dissemination of such information, derived mainly from existing print sources, is designed to make available to interested audiences information that would not otherwise be available or affordable to them. The WECP newsletter, The Work-Education Exchange, will be extended to a larger readership in the coming year to include new contacts reached through national organization constituencies, contacts made by individuals interested in education-work issues, federal agency contacts, and the growing network of contacts in local communities where councils are already functioning. The current circulation of approximately 7,000 issues of each edition of The Work-Education Exchange will be doubled. Periodic mailings of important documents will be made available for the first time to an expanded network of communities that are active in exploring collaborative approaches to education-work issues, in addition to the 33 established Consortium members.

The Information Exchange Service will be the dissemination vehicle for such products as policy papers, case studies, and fact sheets developed by NMI, AACJC, NAB and Consortium communities. Efforts will be made during the coming year to assess the capability of the IES to generate enough support to sustain at least a portion of its operation beyond the end date of this contract.

- Workshops and Conferences. NMI will encourage other interested community groups or agencies to participate in workshops and conferences, a major function of which will be to orient extra-Consortium audiences to the concepts underlying community work-education councils, methods of initiating collaborative action at the community or state levels, and how interested agencies (particularly at the state level) can generate and support local collaborative efforts.

- On-Site Technical Assistance. The Work-Education Consortium, including the National Manpower Institute, in coordination with AACJC and the 33 Consortium member communities, will offer on-site technical assistance services to a select number of interested communities and agencies beyond the Consortium.

C. Intermediary/Representational Functions

As interest in youth transition issues, the collaborative council concept, and the Work-Education Consortium Project has grown, NMI officers and staff have received increasing numbers of requests to represent the project in various national, regional, state, and local conferences and meetings. Increased attention will be given to the representation of Consortium and non-Consortium community interests before agencies of the federal government for (1) technical assistance, (2) attention to regulatory impacts, and (3) review of administrative practices that impair the effectiveness of youth development efforts at the community level.

D. Subcontract Management Functions

An important additional set of project responsibilities is involved in the Institute's assumption of subcontract administration and monitoring for the initiatives in its part of the Consortium. These management functions will involve negotiating, servicing and monitoring multiple subcontracts.

ATTACHMENTS

A. The Work-Education Consortium: An Inventory of Projects in Progress. Available from the National Manpower Institute (NMI), 79 pp., $2.50.

B. Work-Education Councils: Profiles of 21 Collaborative Efforts. Available from NMI, 155 pp., $3.50.

C. Collaborative Process Building for Local Implementation of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. Available from NMI, 70 pp., $2.00.

D. Work and Service Experience for Youth. Available from NMI, 155 pp., $3.00.

E. A Charter for Improved Rural Youth Transition. Available from NMI, 68 pp., $2.50.

F. Community Resources and Career Education: A Needs Assessment of Oakland, California. Available from the Community Careers Council, 1730 Franklin Street, Oakland, California 94612.

G. Council newsletters: Three examples.

H. Agenda for Meeting of the Work-Education Consortium, Columbia, Maryland, April 4-6, 1977.

I. "Youth Development and Employment: Involving the Community," Report on a Consortium Workshop held in Portland, Oregon, October 17-19, 1977, Work-Education Exchange, Winter Issue, Available from NMI, free.

J. Conference Packet: Education to Work in Rural America, a Consortium Conference in Alma, Michigan, November 30 and December 1-2, 1977.

K. Information Exchange Service Mailouts, by Project Quarter.

L. Community Councils and the Transitions Between Education and Work, by Paul E. Barton. Available from NMI, 29 pp., $3.00.

M. On Developing Community Work-Education Councils, by Karl Gudenberg. Available from NMI, 12 pp., $1.50.

N. Designing Youth Policy: Starting Points, by Paul E. Barton, Available from NMI, 33 pp., $3.00.

O. Evaluating the Work-Education Consortium Project: An Overview of Issues and Options, by Steven M. Jung. Available from NMI, 52 pp., $3.50.

P. The Work-Education Exchange, Volume I (No. 1-4) and Volume II (No. 1). Back issues of the Consortium newsletter are available free from NMI.

Q. Job Placement Services for Youth. Available from NMI, 44 pp., $2.00.